

# **Organic Contaminants in Salmonid Spawning Grounds: Occurrences and Effects on the Early Life Stages of Salmonids**

**Lucy Elizabeth Crooks**

**The thesis is submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements  
for the award of degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the  
University of Portsmouth.**

**October 2011**

## **Declaration**

Whilst registered as a candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, I have not registered for any other research award. The results and conclusions embodied in this thesis are the work of the named candidate and have not been submitted for any other academic award.

**Lucy Elizabeth Crooks**

***For Edith Valentine Evans***

*An inspiration to me. A strong minded, stubborn and generous lady, who has left a lasting impression. All characteristics I am proud to have inherited. You always had high aspirations for me and you hoped I would one day become a doctor.*

# CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
LIST OF FIGURES.....	x
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	xvi
ABSTRACT.....	xviii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	xx
1. CHAPTER ONE: GENERAL INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. BACKGROUND.....	1
1.2. LIFE CYCLE OF SALMONIDS.....	4
1.3. SALMONID SPAWNING GRAVEL HABITAT.....	7
1.4. FRESHWATER POLLUTION.....	12
1.4.1 Pesticides.....	14
1.4.2 Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons.....	20
1.4.3 Sediment-Bound Contaminants.....	21
1.5. SUMMARY OF AIMS.....	23
1.6. Outline of Thesis.....	24
2. CHAPTER TWO: GENERAL MATERIALS AND METHODS.....	25
2.1. EXPERIMENTAL EMBRYOS.....	25
2.2. FERTILISATION PROTOCOL.....	25
2.3. EXPERIMENTAL CONDITIONS.....	27
2.4. ARTIFICIAL FRESHWATER (AFW).....	27
2.5. ARTIFICIAL SEDIMENT.....	27
2.6. STANDARD SOLUTIONS (FOR DOSING AND CALIBRATION).....	28
2.7. NUTRIENT ANALYSIS OF FIELD SITES.....	28
2.8. ANALYSIS OF EMBRYOS AND EARLY LIFE STAGES.....	28
2.8.1. Morphometric Measurements.....	28
2.8.2. Observations of Malformations.....	31
2.8.3. Fixatives.....	31
2.8.4. Dry Weight and Water Content Analysis.....	31
2.8.5. Ninhydrin-Positive Substances (NPS).....	32
2.8.6. Protein.....	32
2.8.7. Chloride Analysis.....	33
3. CHAPTER THREE: FIELD TRIALS.....	34
3.1. INTRODUCTION.....	34
3.1.1. Sedimentation of Spawning Gravels.....	34
3.1.2. Groundwater Influences.....	36
3.1.3. The Hyporheic Zone.....	38

3.1.4. <i>Physico-Chemical Properties</i> .....	39
3.1.5. <i>Contaminants</i> .....	41
3.1.6. <i>Organic Content of Sediment</i> .....	46
3.1.7. <i>Methodology</i> .....	47
3.1.8. <i>Artificial Redds</i> .....	49
3.2. MATERIAL AND METHODS.....	52
3.2.1. <i>Field Sites</i> .....	52
3.2.2. <i>Field Equipment</i> .....	56
3.2.3. <i>Placement in the Sites</i> .....	60
3.2.4. <i>Sampling</i> .....	62
3.2.4.1. <i>Measurements</i> .....	62
3.2.5. <i>Water Preparation</i> .....	63
3.2.5.1. <i>Suspended Solids</i> .....	64
3.2.5.2. <i>Pesticide and Hydrocarbon Sample Preparation</i> .....	65
3.2.5.3. <i>Acid Herbicide Preparation</i> .....	65
3.2.6. <i>Sediment Preparation</i> .....	66
3.2.6.1. <i>Sediment Particle Analysis</i> .....	66
3.2.6.2. <i>Sediment Chemical Analysis</i> .....	67
3.2.6.3. <i>Analysis of Sediment Organic Content</i> .....	69
3.2.7. <i>Salmonid Embryos and Alevins</i> .....	69
3.2.7.1. <i>Field Trial 1</i> .....	70
3.2.7.2. <i>Field Trial 2</i> .....	70
3.2.7.3. <i>Field Trial 3</i> .....	71
3.2.8. <i>Field Trial Summary</i> .....	71
3.3. RESULTS.....	71
3.3.1. <i>Physico-Chemical Properties</i> .....	71
3.3.2. <i>Water Chemistry</i> .....	73
3.3.3. <i>Suspended Solids</i> .....	74
3.3.4. <i>Waterborne Contaminants</i> .....	75
3.3.5. <i>Substrate Composition</i> .....	83
3.3.6. <i>Sediment-Bound Contaminants</i> .....	90
3.3.7. <i>Implanted Egg Field Trials</i> .....	99
3.3.7.1. <i>Temperature</i> .....	99
3.3.7.2. <i>Egg Survival</i> .....	101
3.3.7.3. <i>Egg Morphometric Analysis</i> .....	102
3.3.7.4. <i>Egg Biochemical Analysis</i> .....	104
3.3.7.5. <i>Alevin Survival and Analysis</i> .....	107
3.4. DISCUSSION.....	108
3.4.1. <i>Physico-chemical and Water Chemical Parameters</i> .....	108
3.4.2. <i>Substrate Composition</i> .....	109
3.4.3. <i>Spawning Habitat Contaminants</i> .....	110
3.4.4. <i>Field Trials</i> .....	114
3.5. CONCLUSION.....	115

#### **4. CHAPTER FOUR: WATER EXPOSURE TRIALS.....117**

4.1. INTRODUCTION.....	117
4.1.1. <i>Pollution</i> .....	117
4.1.2. <i>Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons</i> .....	118
4.1.3. <i>Pesticides</i> .....	122

4.2. MATERIAL AND METHODS.....	126
4.2.1. <i>Organism</i> .....	126
4.2.2. <i>Experimental Design</i> .....	127
4.2.2.1. Year 1 Experiment.....	129
4.2.2.2. Year 2 Experiment.....	131
4.2.2.3. Year 3 Experiment.....	135
4.2.2.3.1. Experiment One: Exposure from Fertilisation...	135
4.2.2.3.2. Experiment Two: Exposure from Hatching.....	137
4.2.3. <i>Dosing Methodology</i> .....	138
4.2.4. <i>Egg Analysis</i> .....	139
4.2.5. <i>Alevin Analysis</i> .....	140
4.2.6. <i>Statistical Analysis</i> .....	141
4.3. RESULTS.....	142
4.3.1. <i>Year 1</i> .....	142
4.3.2. <i>Year 2 Results</i> .....	146
4.3.3. <i>Year 3 Results</i> .....	153
4.3.3.1. 48hr Fertilisation Experiment.....	153
4.3.3.2. Green Egg Experiment.....	156
4.3.3.3. Eyed Egg Experiment: Exposure from Hatching.....	163
4.3.4. Summary.....	168
4.4. DISCUSSION.....	169
4.4.1. <i>Year 1 Trial</i> .....	170
4.4.2. <i>Year 2 Trial</i> .....	172
4.4.3. <i>Year 3 Trial</i> .....	174
4.4.3.1. 48hr Exposure Trial.....	174
4.4.3.2. Green egg experiment.....	176
4.4.3.3. Alevin Exposure Experiment.....	179
4.4.4. <i>Conclusion</i> .....	179
<b>5. CHAPTER FIVE: SEDIMENT EXPOSURE TRIALS.....</b>	<b>182</b>
5.1. INTRODUCTION.....	182
5.1.1. Sedimentation in spawning gravels.....	182
5.1.2. Organochlorine Pesticides.....	185
5.1.3. Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons.....	187
5.1.4. Triazine Pesticides.....	190
5.1.5. Fluctuating Asymmetry.....	190
5.1.6. Genotoxicity.....	191
5.2. MATERIAL AND METHODS.....	193
5.2.1. Organism.....	193
5.2.2. Experimental Design.....	193
5.2.3. Contaminant Preparation.....	196
5.2.4. Year 1 Experiment.....	198
5.2.5. Year 2 Experiment.....	200
5.2.5.1. Fluctuating Asymmetry.....	203
5.2.5.2. Comet Assay.....	203
5.2.6. Year 3 Experiment.....	205
5.2.7. Statistical Analysis.....	206
5.3. RESULTS.....	207
5.3.1. Year 1.....	207

5.3.1.1. Egg Results (d35PF and d49PF).....	209
5.3.1.2. Alevin Results (d70PF).....	212
5.3.1.3. Fry Results (d98PF).....	215
5.3.2. Year 2.....	216
5.3.2.1. Egg Results (d47PF).....	217
5.3.2.2. Alevin Results (d68PF).....	219
5.3.2.3. Fry Results (d134PF).....	221
5.3.2.3.1. Fluctuating Asymmetry.....	223
5.3.2.3.2. Genotoxicity.....	231
5.3.3. Year 3.....	235
5.3.3.1. Egg Results (d51PF).....	236
5.3.3.2. Alevin Results (d100PF).....	237
5.3.3.3. Fry Results (d125PF).....	238
5.3.4 Summary.....	239
5.4. DISCUSSION.....	240
5.4.1. Morphometric measurements.....	241
5.4.2. Biochemical analysis.....	245
5.4.3. Fluctuating Asymmetry.....	246
5.4.4. Genotoxicity.....	248
5.4.5. Conclusions.....	250
<b>6. CHAPTER SIX: GENERAL DISCUSSION.....</b>	<b>253</b>
<b>7. CHAPTER SEVEN: REFERENCE LIST.....</b>	<b>264</b>
<b>8. CHAPTER EIGHT: APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>300</b>
8.1 APPENDIX 1. PALINTEST REAGENTS .....	300
8.2 APPENDIX 2. FIXATIVES .....	301
8.3 APPENDIX 3. NINHYDRIN POSITIVE SUBSTANCE ANALYSIS (REAGENTS) .....	303
8.4 APPENDIX 4. PROTEIN ANALYSIS (REAGENTS) .....	303
8.5 APPENDIX 5. COMET ASSAY (REAGENTS).....	303

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1. Terminology of Salmonid Early Life Stages.....	5
Table 1.2. Guideline Values for Drinking Water Quality (WHO, 2006).....	20
Table 3.1. Sediment Particle Size Classification (Wentworth, 1922) .....	35
Table 3.2. Pesticide data in $\text{ng l}^{-1}$ for the River Avon at Stratford Sub-Castle, data represents mean $\pm$ SEM (Raw data courtesy of EA).....	44
Table 3.3. Pesticide data in $\text{ng l}^{-1}$ for the River Nadder at Wilton, data represents mean $\pm$ SEM (Raw data courtesy of EA).....	45
Table 3.4. Pesticide data in $\text{ng l}^{-1}$ for the River Wylye at South Newton, data represents mean $\pm$ SEM (Raw data courtesy of EA).....	46
Table 3.5. Location and Grid References of the Field Sites (Refer to map in Figure 3.14).....	56
Table 3.6. Physico-Chemical Properties represented as Mean $\pm$ SE; Depth (cm), Flow ( $\text{ms}^{-1}$ ), Temp ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ), Conductivity ( $\mu\text{S/cm}$ ) and Dissolved $\text{O}_2$ ( $\text{mg/l}$ ).....	72
Table 3.7. Hyporheic dissolved oxygen concentrations at each field site.....	73
Table 3.8. Chemical Properties measured represented as Mean $\pm$ SE; Phosphate, Sulphate, Nitrite and Nitrate shown as $\text{mg/l}$ ; total Ammonia Nitrogen (TAN) measured as $\mu\text{g/l}$ .....	74
Table 3.9. Percentage detection of acid herbicides at the field sites. MCPA=2-methyl-4-chlorophenoxyacetic acid. MCPB=4-(4-chloro-o-tolyloxy)butyric acid. PCP=Pentachlorophenol.....	75
Table 3.10. Percentage detection of triazine herbicides at the field sites.....	77
Table 3.11. Percentage detection of organochlorine compounds from the field sites.....	79
Table 3.12. Percentage detection of PAHs from the field sites.....	81
Table 3.13. Fredle Index (d75/d25) values for each site.....	88
Table 3.14. Fredle Index (d84/d16) values for each site.....	89
Table 3.15. Percentage detection of sediment-bound triazines from the field sites. DIA=Desisopropylatrazine. DEA=Desethylatrazine.....	90
Table 3.16. Percentage detection of sediment-bound Organochlorine pesticides in the from the field sites.....	93



Table 3.17. Percentage detection of sediment-bound PAH compounds from the field sites.....	96
Table 3.18. Morphometric analysis of <i>Salmo salar</i> eggs (Data represents Mean±SEM)..	104
Table 3.19. Biochemical analysis of <i>Salmo salar</i> eggs (Data represents Mean±SEM)....	107
Table 4.1 Concentrations of PAH Solutions.....	132
Table 4.2. Concentrations of TRI Solutions.....	133
Table 4.3. Concentrations of OCP Solutions.....	133
Table 4.4. Concentrations of AH Solutions.....	134
Table 4.5. Concentrations of MIX Solutions.....	134
Table 4.6. Morphometric analysis of <i>Salmo trutta</i> eggs.....	143
Table 4.7. Biochemical analysis of <i>Salmo trutta</i> eggs.....	144
Table 4.8. Morphometric analysis of <i>Salmo trutta</i> eggs.....	149
Table 4.9. Biochemical analysis of <i>Salmo trutta</i> eggs.....	151
Table 4.10. Morphometric analysis of <i>Salmo trutta</i> alevins.....	152
Table 4.11. Morphometric analysis of <i>Salmo trutta</i> eggs.....	154
Table 4.12. Morphometric analysis of <i>Salmo trutta</i> eggs.....	158
Table 4.13. Biochemical analysis of <i>Salmo trutta</i> eggs.....	159
Table 4.14. Morphometric analysis of <i>Salmo trutta</i> alevins.....	160
Table 4.15. Morphometric and biochemical analysis of <i>Salmo trutta</i> alevins.....	161
Table 4.16. Morphometric and biochemical analysis of <i>Salmo trutta</i> alevins.....	165
Table 4.17. Summary matrix of significant results for water exposure trials.....	169
Table 5.1. Concentration of PAHs for Sediment Exposure Trials.....	195
Table 5.2. Concentration of OCPs for Sediment Exposure Trials.....	196
Table 5.3. Concentration of Triazines for Sediment Exposure Trials.....	196
Table 5.4. Stock solution calculations and concentrations of the PAHs.....	196

Table 5.5. Working solution concentrations of the PAHs.....	197
Table 5.6. Stock solution calculations and concentrations of the OCPs.....	197
Table 5.7. Working solution concentrations of the OCPs.....	197
Table 5.8. Stock solution calculations and concentrations of the Triazines (TRIs).....	197
Table 5.9. Working solution concentrations of the TRIs.....	198
Table 5.10. Morphometric analysis of <i>Salmo trutta</i> eggs.....	210
Table 5.11. Biochemical analysis of <i>Salmo trutta</i> eggs.....	212
Table 5.12. Morphometric and biochemical analysis of <i>Salmo trutta</i> alevins.....	213
Table 5.13. Morphometric analysis of <i>Salmo trutta</i> fry.....	215
Table 5.14. Morphometric analysis of <i>Salmo trutta</i> eggs.....	218
Table 5.15. Biochemical analysis of <i>Salmo trutta</i> eggs.....	219
Table 5.16. Morphometric and biochemical analysis of <i>Salmo trutta</i> alevins.....	220
Table 5.17. Morphometric analysis of <i>Salmo salar</i> fry.....	222
Table 5.18. Morphometric analysis of <i>Salmo trutta</i> eggs.....	236
Table 5.19. Egg dry weight and water content analysis.....	237
Table 5.20. Morphometric analysis of <i>Salmo salar</i> fry.....	238
Table 5.21. Dry weight and water content of <i>Salmo salar</i> fry.....	239
Table 5.22. Summary matrix of significant results for sediment exposure trials.....	240

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1. A 25,000 year old relief of a salmon from the cave Gorge d'Enfer.....	2
Figure 1.2. Categorization of salmon-bearing rivers in England and Wales.....	3
Figure 1.3. The life cycle of the Atlantic salmon.....	4
Figure 1.4. National scale sediment source apportionment for England and Wales, under current environmental conditions.....	9
Figure 1.5. A schematic of the hyporheic zone.....	11
Figure 1.6. Routes of entry into the freshwater environment.....	13
Figure 1.7. Area treated with pesticides in England and Wales.....	14
Figure 1.8. Pesticides in surface waters in England and Wales, 1998 to 2007.....	15
Figure 1.9. The percentage of groundwater monitoring sites which have detected pesticides.....	16
Figure 2.1. <i>Salmo salar</i> eggs from Cynrig hatchery before transportation.....	25
Figure 2.2. Addition of milt (a) and water (b) to fertilise the green salmonid eggs.....	26
Figure 2.3. Salmonid egg indicating the measurement of diameter.....	29
Figure 2.4. Alevin length measurements were taken as total length.....	30
Figure 2.5. Alevin of <i>Salmo salar</i> , showing site of dissection of yolk sac for analysis of % yolk of the total body weight.....	30
Figure 2.6. An example of a possible malformation, a yolk sac oedema (YSO).....	31
Figure 3.1. Hyporheic Zone.....	38
Figure 3.2. Land use adjacent to UK chalk streams.....	42
Figure 3.3. Location of the Avon catchment in the UK (Environment Agency).....	52
Figure 3.4. Map of the Rivers Avon, Wylfe and Nadder (Environment Agency).....	53
Figure 3.5. Sites on the Rivers Avon, Wylfe and Nadder where Atlantic salmon spawning and redds occur (Environment Agency).....	54
Figure 3.6. Map of the Field Sites on the Rivers Wylfe, Nadder, and Avon (Environment Agency).....	54

Figure 3.7. Both field sites on the River Wylfe at Wilton House Estate.....	55
Figure 3.8. Both field sites on the River Nadder; one at Wilton House Estate; one just outside the perimeter of the Wilton House Estate.....	55
Figure 3.9. River Avon field site at Stratford Sub-Castle.....	56
Figure 3.10. Infiltration basket (Height = 30cm, Diameter = 20cm).....	57
Figure 3.11. Infiltration basket.....	57
Figure 3.12. Infiltration Basket in implantation position.....	58
Figure 3.13. Hyporheic water sampler.....	58
Figure 3.14. Schematic of hyporheic water sampler used for pumping the water from the hyporheic zone.....	59
Figure 3.15. Schematic of inner tubing of the hyporheic water sampler.....	59
Figure 3.16. Netlon® egg boxes for implantation into the riverbed.....	59
Figure 3.17. Schematic of cross-sectional view of artificial redd.....	61
Figure 3.18. Schematic of birdseye view of artificial redd.....	61
Figure 3.19. Implantation of the egg boxes with the implantation tool.....	62
Figure 3.20. Logging dissolved oxygen concentrations from pumped hyporheic water simultaneously with concentrations from surface water.....	63
Figure 3.21. Water samples taken from different field sites.....	64
Figure 3.22. Suspended solid samples from a winter sampling day.....	64
Figure 3.23. Measured dissolved oxygen concentration of hyporheic and surface water on the River Avon.....	73
Figure 3.24. Suspended solids of water samples.....	75
Figure 3.25. Water concentrations of detected levels of acid herbicides at the field sites.....	76
Figure 3.26. Water concentrations of detected levels of desisopropylatrazine, desethylatrazine and atrazine at the field sites.....	78
Figure 3.27. Water concentrations of detected levels of OCPs for each site.....	80
Figure 3.28. Water concentrations of detected levels of PAHs for each site.....	82

Figure 3.29. Sediment loading in field sites from substrate taken from infiltration baskets over a three month period.....	83
Figure 3.30. Percentage particle size fraction.....	84
Figure 3.31. The amount of sediment <4mm deposited per day per trap in the sediment traps at the field sites.....	84
Figure 3.32. The amount of sediment <2mm deposited in the sediment traps at the field sites.....	85
Figure 3.33. The amount of sediment <63µm deposited in the sediment traps at the field sites.....	86
Figure 3.34. Geometric mean of the sediment particles collected in the infiltration baskets.....	86
Figure 3.35. Sorting coefficient of sediment particles collected in the infiltration baskets at the 75 <sup>th</sup> and 25 <sup>th</sup> percentile quotient.....	87
Figure 3.36. Sorting coefficient of sediment particles collected in the infiltration baskets at the 84 <sup>th</sup> and 16 <sup>th</sup> percentile quotient.....	88
Figure 3.37. Organic content of 63µm particle size sediment.....	89
Figure 3.38. Concentrations of triazine compounds detected in the sediments.....	91
Figure 3.39. Sediment-bound triazines concentrations detected in the substrate samples...	92
Figure 3.40. Contaminant concentrations of the OCPs found in the sediment (<63µm) samples from each site.....	94
Figure 3.41. Sediment-bound organochlorines concentrations detected in the substrate samples from all sites.....	95
Figure 3.42. Contaminant concentrations of the PAHs found in the sediment (<63µm) samples from each site.....	97
Figure 3.43. Sediment-bound PAH concentrations detected in the substrate samples from all sites.....	98
Figure 3.44. Sediment-bound PAH concentrations detected in the substrate samples from all sites.....	99
Figure 3.45. Water temperature in the River Wylfe over the spawning season during the first field trial.....	100
Figure 3.46. Water temperature in the River Nadder over the spawning season during the second field trial.....	100

Figure 3.47. Water temperature in the River Avon over the spawning season and during the third field trial.....	101
Figure 3.48. Egg survival at each field site for all the field trials.....	102
Figure 4.1. Zebra fish exposed to PHEN demonstrating spinal curvature (a), eye malformations (b) and yolk sac malformations (c).....	120
Figure 4.2. Zebra fish exposed to NAPH showing normal development.....	121
Figure 4.3. Pesticides detected in groundwater in England and Wales.....	123
Figure 4.4. Positioning of beakers within the incubator room.....	128
Figure 4.5. Astro-Turf discs in beakers to reduce motility of newly fertilised eggs. (Year Experiments).....	128
Figure 4.6. An eye-pigmented brown trout egg with scale.....	129
Figure 4.7. Astroturf in beaker to reduce motility of eggs.....	136
Figure 4.8. Removal of water still left enough for the eggs to continue to be exposed.....	137
Figure 4.9. Parafilm placed on top of each beaker to prevent contamination.....	139
Figure 4.10. A fertilised egg (Control Treatment) Blastodisc (BD) and Chorion (C) identified by red arrows.....	140
Figure 4.11. YS removal for % body and yolk sac weights.....	141
Figure 4.12. Mean hatch day (dPE) for alevins for each treatment.....	145
Figure 4.13. Alevin total weight on hatch for each treatment.....	145
Figure 4.14. Alevin body weight and yolk sac weight on hatching, shown as a percentage of total weight.....	146
Figure 4.15. Egg Survival of brown trout.....	147
Figure 4.16. Brown trout eggs dead on hatch and eggs with arrested development.....	147
Figure 4.17. Body weight and yolk sac weight, as a percentage of total weight.....	152
Figure 4.18. 48hr exposure trial images.....	155
Figure 4.19. Survival of the fertilisation to eyeing stage.....	156
Figure 4.20. Survival from eyed to hatch (to end).....	157

Figure 4.21. Alevin body weight and yolk sac weight, as a percentage of total weight, on day 93 post fertilisation, from eggs which had been fertilised in the relevant treatment prior to exposure.....	162
Figure 4.22. Alevins at day 93 post fertilisation.....	163
Figure 4.23. Survival of the eyed eggs from hatching to end of exposure.....	164
Figure 4.24. Alevin body weight and yolk sac weight, as a percentage of total weight, at day 18 post exposure.....	167
Figure 4.25. Alevins at day 38 post exposure.....	168
Figure 5.1. CEFAS, Lowestoft aquarium facilities; Incubators and Emergence Tanks....	193
Figure 5.2. Emergence tanks showing mesh box to catch the swim up fry.....	194
Figure 5.3. Incubators used for sediment trials i) showing emergence tank; ii) incubator.....	199
Figure 5.4. Photograph of a brown trout sample depicting the point of measurement for body depth.....	201
Figure 5.5. Brown trout photographs representing each yolk sac score.....	202-203
Figure 5.6. Image generated by the comet assay; H – head region; T – tail region.....	205
Figure 5.7. Daily temperature measurements of the incubator water.....	208
Figure 5.8. Mortality rate at different developmental stages.....	208
Figure 5.9. Percentage yolk sac (YS) and percentage body weight (BW) of alevins d70PF.....	214
Figure 5.10. YS oedemas from PAH exposed alevins.....	214
Figure 5.11. Total observed yolk sac oedemas as a percentage of total alevins.....	215
Figure 5.12. Regular temperature readings of the sediment exposure trial water.....	216
Figure 5.13. Mortality rate at different developmental stages.....	217
Figure 5.14. Percentage yolk sac (YS) and percentage body weight (BW) of alevins d68PF.....	220
Figure 5.15. Total observed yolk sac oedemas as a percentage of total alevins.....	221
Figure 5.16. Body depth of brown trout fry for each treatment.....	222
Figure 5.17. Yolk sac score of brown trout fry (0-5) for each treatment.....	223

Figure 5.18. Eye height (L-R) of brown trout for each treatment.....	224
Figure 5.19. The type of symmetry (left (L), right (R) and symmetrical (S)) and the percentage of symmetry found for each treatment for eye height.....	225
Figure 5.20. Eye width (L-R) of brown trout for each treatment.....	226
Figure 5.21. The type of symmetry (left (L), right (R) and symmetrical (S)) and the percentage of symmetry found for each treatment for eye width.....	227
Figure 5.22. Pectoral fin ray counts (L-R) of brown trout for each treatment.....	228
Figure 5.23. The type of symmetry (left (L), right (R) and symmetrical (S)) and the percentage of symmetry found for each treatment for pectoral fin ray counts.....	229
Figure 5.24. Pelvic fin ray counts (L-R) of brown trout for each treatment.....	230
Figure 5.25. The type of symmetry (left (L), right (R) and symmetrical (S)) and the percentage of symmetry found for each treatment for pelvic fin ray counts.....	231
Figure 5.26. Comet from a blood cell of a control group fry.....	232
Figure 5.27. UV+ve Control (UV exposed blood cell to validate the assay).....	232
Figure 5.28. Comet Assay analysis showing Tail Length.....	232
Figure 5.29. Comet from the blood cell of an OCP exposed fry.....	233
Figure 5.30. Comet from the blood cell of an OCP plus PAH exposed fry.....	233
Figure 5.31. Comet Assay analysis showing Tail Intensity.....	234
Figure 5.32. Comet Assay analysis showing Tail Moment.....	234
Figure 5.33. Daily temperature readings throughout the sediment exposure trial.....	235
Figure 5.34. Mortality rates of brown trout at each stage of development. Data represents mean average percentage of mortality.....	235
Figure 5.35. Lengths of juveniles at day 100 post fertilisation.....	237
Figure 5.36. Weights of juveniles at day 100 post fertilisation.....	238



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are so many people who I would like to thank for their support and help throughout my study. I am incredibly grateful to DEFRA, whose funding made this PhD possible. I would firstly like to thank my supervisor, Dr Colin Waring. Thank you for giving me this opportunity and for your advice and support throughout the duration of my study. Thank you for your open door policy so I knew I could always approach you for guidance. Also, more importantly, thank you for accompanying me on the cold and wet field trips to collect samples and buying cake!

I will always be indebted to Dr Jennifer Best and Dr Branislav Vrana who guided and taught me the chemistry aspects of my research. You both provided invaluable support with the GCMS analysis. Thank you for your patience and knowledge.

Thank you to all the willing volunteers who enabled me to successfully undertake my field work, far too many to mention individually but all as valued. Without such help it would not have been possible to take so many trips to my sites. A special mention to Keith Luxford who as well as helping with field work, also was my Mr Fix It for the duration of my PhD. Your patience and willingness to help was outstanding. Thank you.

Thank you to Maureen Sims, Maria Godfrey, Christine Hughes and David Maund for their laboratory support and assistance. Thank you also to Bernie Higgins for his time and guidance with the nested design statistical analysis.

Thank you to the staff at CEFAS, Lowestoft, for support and help with the experiments I conducted at their facilities. Thank you in particular to Dr Andy Moore, Dr Nicola Lower, Lucia Privitera and Dr Marta Assuncao for all your help and company during my time with you. Also, to Freya Goodsir for your guidance with the Comet assay. A special thank you to Mark Smith, Stuart Hetherington and Matthew Eade for all their assistance with the aquarium facilities.

Thank you to Janine Bruemmer and Raquel Falcon for being great friends, great humoured office buddies and my go to chemists. Thank you also to my current line manager, Adam Bonner, for his support and understanding. And also to all my friends who have always supported and encouraged me to keep going.

I would also like to thank undergraduate students Shelley Reed, Hazel Stanworth, Will Ward, Bryony Marsh, Marc Parish, Jason Wells, Claire Simner and Harriet O'Farrell for their assistance with my research during their undergraduate project research.

A special thank you to my amazing parents, Rodney and Stephanie, who always encouraged and supported me in anything I ever chose to do. Without both your financial and emotional support I would never have got this far. Thank you also to my brother, David, for always showing a keen interest in my research and believing it was all worthwhile. I am very lucky to have you all and for your continued support.

Last, but certainly not least, thank you to my wonderful husband who always encourages and supports me. For ensuring I never lost sight and just being there whenever I needed you, whether it was digging a hole in a riverbed, water changes in a freezing incubation room or just for a reassuring hug. Without your support I would never have found the motivation.

## ABSTRACT

The factors regulating salmonid populations remain poorly understood, although contamination of the freshwater environment has been implicated as a causative factor. Depletion of stocks has become an increasing concern and it is believed that the early life stages are potentially the most vulnerable. Reduction in salmonid stocks has been reportedly linked to water quality and this current study has shown that freshwater pollution can affect the survival and development of salmonids. Environmental concentrations measured in this study varied greatly and high levels of sediment-bound contaminants were found, especially polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons. Concentrations of waterborne contaminants were similar to levels previously measured, with some high level peaks in triazine metabolites. Field studies, as previous literature has suggested, found a higher mortality in river sites of greater sediment and nutrient loading and in sites with a greater proportion of fine sediment ( $<63\mu\text{m}$ ). The River Avon was found to have a higher concentration of fine sediment and mortality of implanted eggs in this site was significantly higher than in the Rivers Wylfe and Nadder. Although mortality of eggs implanted in river field sites was generally high, few morphometrics and biochemical effects were observed. Laboratory studies examined the toxicity of environmentally relevant levels of water-borne and sediment-bound contaminants on the brown trout (*Salmo trutta*) but found few acute effects and no specific trends were observed. The results did reveal a higher frequency of yolk sac oedemas for contaminant-exposed alevins in the laboratory trials compared to the control groups. In general survival was high for both the eyed egg and alevin stages when exposed to the water-borne contaminants. However, survival was greatly reduced when the water-borne contaminant exposures were carried out from the fertilisation stage compared to the eyed stage. Generally, sediment-bound contaminants had a greater effect on survival at the egg stage and mortalities were found to be reduced at the fry stage. Additionally, the results from the comet assays revealed that exposure to sediment-bound organochlorine pesticides and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons did induce significant acute effects in the form of DNA damage when compared to the control. Such results could indicate that certain pollutants may be problematic for the species at later stages of their development and on into adulthood.

In general the findings of this research proved largely inconclusive in terms of specific impacts of contaminants on the early developmental stages of Atlantic salmon and brown trout. The results of these studies did show that the presence of common pollutants within the freshwater environment can have impacts on the survival and development of salmonids. These impacts may have serious implications throughout the lifecycle and could impact heavily on recruitment and survival at both the juvenile and adult life stages, potentially leading to a reduction of wild populations.

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<b>AFW</b>	Artificial Freshwater
<b>AH</b>	Acid Herbicides
<b>Amm.</b>	Ammonia
<b>ATR</b>	Atrazine
<b>BW</b>	Body Weight
<b>CEFAS</b>	Centre for Environment Fisheries and Aquaculture Science
<b>CNT</b>	Control
<b>DDD</b>	Dichlorodiphenyldichloroethane
<b>DDE</b>	Dichlorodiphenyldichloroethylene
<b>DDT</b>	Dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane
<b>DEA</b>	Desethylpropylatrazine
<b>DIA</b>	Desisopropylatrazine
<b>dnPF</b>	Days Post-Fertilisation
<b>EA</b>	Environment Agency
<b>FA</b>	Fluctuating Asymmetry
<b>FAA</b>	Free Amino Acids
<b>GCMS</b>	Gas Chromatography Mass Spectrometry
<b>GFC</b>	Glass Fibre Cartridge
<b>K</b>	Condition Factor
<b>MCPA</b>	2-Methyl-4-Chlorophenoxyacetic Acid
<b>MCPB</b>	2-Methyl-4-Chlorophenoxy Butyric Acid
<b>MPL</b>	Maximum Permissible Level
<b>NAPH</b>	Naphthalene
<b>NPS</b>	Ninhydrin Positive Substances
<b>NBF</b>	Neutrally Buffered Formalin
<b>OCP</b>	OrganoChlorine Pesticides
<b>OCP+PAH</b>	OrganoChlorine Pesticides plus Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons
<b>PAH</b>	Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons

<b>PBS</b>	Phosphate Buffered Saline
<b>PHEN</b>	Phenanthrene
<b>POP</b>	Persistent Organic Pollutants
<b>PROM</b>	Prometryn
<b>PROP</b>	Propazine
<b>RO</b>	Reverse Osmosis
<b>SA:Vol</b>	Surface Area to Volume Ratio
<b>SEM</b>	Standard Error of the Mean
<b>SIM</b>	Simazine
<b>SOL</b>	Solvent Control
<b>SPE</b>	Solid Phase Extraction
<b>TAN</b>	Total Ammonia Nitrogen
<b>TCA</b>	Trichloroacetic Acid
<b>TRI</b>	Triazines
<b>WWF</b>	World Wildlife Fund
<b>YS</b>	Yolk Sac
<b>YSO</b>	Yolk Sac Oedema